# NFER evidence on access and achievement of children in poverty in England

**Research paper for Ofsted's 'Access and achievement in education 2013 review'**

National Foundation for Educational Research

# Wilshaw submission: NFER evidence on access and achievement/ educational success in deprived communities

**Key messages from NFER research on 'narrowing' or 'closing' the gap**

**Effective Classroom Strategies for Closing the Gap in Educational Achievement for Children and Young People Living in Poverty, Including White Working-Class Boys**
Reference: Sharples, J., Slavin, R., Chambers, B. and Sharp, C. (2011). *Effective Classroom Strategies for Closing the Gap in Educational Achievement for Children and Young People Living in Poverty, Including White Working-Class Boys* (C4EO Schools and Communities Research Review 4). London: C4EO [online]. Available: http://www.c4eo.org.uk/themes/schools/classroomstrategies/files/classroom_strategies_research_review.pdf

This research review examined what works in closing the gap in educational achievement for children and young people living in poverty, including white working-class boys.  It adopted a mixed-methods approach – a qualitative review of observational and correlational research conducted in the UK, supported by a quantitative review of trials of classroom interventions, drawn from international studies.  The first provides a wider picture of good practice in UK schools (although not 'proven') and the second shows where there is a direct causal link between a specific approach and learning outcomes, although not necessarily drawn from UK schools.

**Key messages**
- Classroom strategies shown to be effective for one ethnic or socio-economic group tend also to be effective for others.
- Schools in the UK are adopting a number of promising strategies to improve outcomes for children living in poverty. These include:
  - rigorous monitoring and use of data
  - raising pupil aspirations using engagement/aspiration programmes
  - engaging parents and raising parental aspirations
  - developing social and emotional competencies
  - supporting school transitions
  - providing strong and visionary leadership.
- International research evidence, based on experimental trials, identifies some common classroom strategies that work across different subjects and educational phases. The most important of these findings are that:

- The quality of teaching makes the biggest difference to learning outcomes.
- Coaching teachers/teaching assistants in specific teaching strategies significantly raises outcomes for children living in poverty. Evidence-based approaches include cooperative learning (structured groupwork), frequent assessment and 'learning to learn' strategies.
- Adopting new curricula does not, in general, produce large improvements in learning outcomes.
- Classroom interventions that close attainment gaps often adopt proven classroom management strategies, for example a rapid pace of instruction, using all-pupil responses and developing a common language for discipline.
- Traditional use of information and communication technology (ICT) (e.g. individualised, self-instructional programmes) has minimal impact on attainment for children living in poverty. Whole-class approaches, such as the use of interactive whiteboards and embedded multimedia, show greater promise.
- Whole-school reform models, which address multiple elements of school provision, can produce substantial improvements in academic outcomes.
- The most powerful improvements in achievement are produced through the use of well-specified, well-supported and well-implemented programmes, incorporating extensive professional development.

The international research evidence found further that:
- For struggling readers living in poverty:
  - Structured phonics-based approaches, in general, work better than non-phonics approaches.
  - One-to-one tutoring by qualified teachers is very effective for improving literacy outcomes, but this is an expensive strategy. Tutoring by teaching assistants and volunteers can produce positive outcomes if they are well trained and use structured phonics materials.
  - Intervening immediately is most effective for primary reading, where preventative whole-class strategies are adopted first, followed by tutoring for the small number of pupils who still need it.
- In early childhood programmes:
  - Those with explicit emergent literacy instruction and clear teaching objectives provide the greatest improvements in school readiness, when they are implemented in a developmentally appropriate way.

In more detail, the review found that:
- Children and young people living in poverty respond to classroom interventions that improve instructional processes and teaching methods. Well-specified and well-supported programmes and practices provide the greatest learning outcomes, which motivate and engage all learners, not just those from poor backgrounds. Children from deprived areas respond positively to opportunities that raise their aspirations for learning and future success.

- Parents and carers should be actively engaged by schools to support their child's development and learning. Breaking cycles of low aspiration and disenfranchisement with education is an important step for narrowing attainment gaps.
- Strong and visionary leadership, provided by head teachers and principals, is often the driving force behind improving outcomes for children living in poverty.
- Senior decision-makers play a key role in improving teaching strategies, by providing extensive professional development in evidence-based programmes and practices.
- As the direct contact point with pupils in schools, education staff are the key route to inspiring children from low-income families into learning. They need to develop their teaching methods to meet the needs of these young people in line with evidence-based strategies drawn from the profession and research.
- Local authorities need to work across the Early Years Foundation Stage sector, primary and secondary schools to support the adoption of evidence-based programmes and practices in schools. They should encourage changes in pedagogy through extensive, school-based professional development. They should plan targeted approaches to raise the aspirations of children from low-income families and engage parents in school life.
- In a climate of financial austerity it is crucial that schools target any new resources for poor children into interventions that are proven to raise outcomes. National policy-makers should support the use of evidence-based strategies and interventions, and build more widespread access to programmes of this kind.


**Narrowing the Gap in Outcomes for Young Children through Effective Practices in the Early Years**
Reference: Coghlan, M., Bergeron, C., White, K., Sharp, C., Morris, M. and Wilson, R. (2010). *Narrowing the Gap in Outcomes for Young Children through Effective Practices in the Early Years* (C4EO Early Years Knowledge Review 1). London: Centre for Excellence and Outcomes in Children and Young People's Services [online]. Available:
http://www.c4eo.org.uk/themes/earlyyears/ntg/files/c4eo_narrowing_the_gap_full_knowledge_review.pdf

This rapid review involved the systematic searching of research literature and analysis of key data, along with the inclusion of validated local practice examples and the views from both people using services and service providers. It summarises the best available evidence to help service providers to improve services and, ultimately, outcomes for children, young people and their families.

**Key messages**
- Poverty has the greatest influence on children's outcomes in the early years. It affects at least 2.9 million children and young people in the UK – particularly those from Pakistani and Bangladeshi backgrounds. Poverty can lead to poor health and poor academic progress (especially communication, language and literacy; mathematical development; and personal, social and emotional development). A joined-up approach to tackling child poverty is crucial.

- Providing support for children and families whose first language is not English is also vital. Poverty and English as an additional language (EAL) needs are the root cause of most of the associations between ethnicity and child outcomes. Few attainment differences between ethnic groups remain at age five, and none remain at age seven, once these factors are considered.
- Developing strategies to help parents engage in their children's learning and development, as well as their own education, is important. A positive home learning environment (HLE) can help counter the effects of poverty on children's learning and development throughout the early years. A good level of education among mothers (especially having a degree) can also help to achieve this.
- Attending pre-school can have a positive impact on children's academic and social development – a benefit that can be sustained into later schooling.  Attendance can be particularly helpful for children from poorer socio-economic backgrounds and for those for whom English is not their first language. Early years interventions can narrow the gap between disadvantaged children and other children in terms of their cognitive development, as well as their social and behavioural development.
- The quality of early years provision is important. High-quality early years provision has been found to have a positive impact on the cognitive and social development of young children and to impact on their later learning.


**A Review of the Research Evidence: Narrowing the Gap in Outcomes for Vulnerable Groups**
Reference: Kendall, S., Straw, S., Jones, M., Springate, I. and Grayson, H. (2008). *A Review of the Research Evidence (Narrowing the Gap in Outcomes for Vulnerable Groups)*.  Slough: NFER [online]. Available: http://www.nfer.ac.uk/publications/LNG01/

In 2007, the Local Government Association (LGA) commissioned the NFER to review the best evidence on what works in narrowing the gap in outcomes for vulnerable groups across the five Every Child Matters areas. The review aimed to underpin the Narrowing the Gap Programme, a major development programme being implemented by the LGA and the then DCSF.

**Key messages**
The review found that:
- Strategies promoting children's health, safety and economic stability all help to provide the necessary conditions to support effective and enjoyable learning and raise achievement.
- Interventions to remediate disadvantage and narrow the gap in outcomes for vulnerable groups need a long-term focus.
- Interventions which adopt a holistic and joined-up approach and deal with the range of obstacles and negative influences holding children back are the most effective.
- Interventions that focus on the whole family and involve children learning and working with their parents/carers are some of the most effective.

- Interventions need to build upon the positive elements and experiences of children's and family lives and take account of value and belief systems.


**Narrowing the Gap in Outcomes: Early Years (0-5 years)**
Reference: Springate, I., Atkinson, M., Straw, S., Lamont, E. and Grayson, H.(2008).
*Narrowing the Gap in Outcomes: Early Years (0-5 years)*. Slough: NFER [online]. Available:
http://www.nfer.ac.uk/publications/LNG02/

Commissioned by the LGA to inform the then DCSF and LGA work on 'Narrowing the Gap', this review of the best evidence on narrowing the gap in outcomes across the five Every Child Matters (ECM) areas focused on early years' provision for vulnerable groups in the context of improving outcomes for all.

The review evidence demonstrated that:
- Interventions focused on children in their early years have the potential to improve outcomes that are fundamental to their future life chances, and to narrow the gap between disadvantaged and other children.
- Improvements in cognitive development, social/behavioural development and health outcomes can be achieved in the short-term, and there is some evidence that these outcomes can be sustained into later life.

Four cross-cutting themes are identified as contributing to successful practice – the involvement of parents; the delivery of interventions that are of high quality, delivered by qualified and skilled professionals; interventions that are able to meet the specific needs of the individual child and, if appropriate, their family; and interventions that help build constructive relationships between adults (staff and parents) and children.


**Narrowing the Gap in Outcomes: Governance**
Reference: Lord, P., Hart, R., Martin, K. and Atkinson, M. (2009). *Narrowing the Gap in Outcomes: Governance (LGA Research Report)*. Slough: NFER [online]. Available:
http://www.nfer.ac.uk/publications/NGG01/

This report, based on a literature review and interviews with case study local authorities, aimed to identify whether governance has an effective role in narrowing the gap between vulnerable children and young people and other children.

Findings:
- The literature provides very little evidence of narrowed gaps or improved outcomes that are directly related to governance.
- Evidence from the case studies, however, demonstrates that  governance arrangements have the potential to improve outcomes for young people and to narrow the gap between disadvantaged and other children.

- Effective governance can contribute to improvements in educational outcomes, safeguarding outcomes and young people's participation and voice, although provable links are difficult to ascertain.
- Effective governance for narrowing the gap is not fundamentally different from effective governance generally. However, the gap appears to be narrowed through governance which emphasises the following ingredients:
  - Processes: a vision that explicitly sets out the outcomes which are the focus and the gaps which need to be narrowed; the allocation of appropriate resources; and opportunities for reviewing progress
  - Frameworks: protocols, roles, responsibilities and lines of accountability provide opportunities for people to come together to focus on the goal of narrowing the gap
  - Participants: there is wide and representative participation, including service users, the voluntary, community and faith sectors, and staff at all levels. This provides real opportunities for all stakeholders to influence decisions.

Underpinning the key elements outlined above, there needs to be a collective 'can do' ethos that is not afraid of 'challenge', and, crucially, the flexibility to respond to emerging needs. This means being able to shift resources to areas of need, to include new representatives in governing bodies so that the identified group is represented, and to align roles, responsibilities and lines of accountability with shifting foci. Constantly reviewing progress towards the goal of narrowing the gap is important.


**Narrowing the Gap in Outcomes: Leadership**
Reference: Martin, K., Lord, P., White, R. and Atkinson, M. (2009). *Narrowing the Gap in Outcomes: Leadership (LGA Research Report)*. Slough: NFER [online]. Available: http://www.nfer.ac.uk/publications/NGL01/

This report, based on a literature review and interviews with case study local authorities, aimed to identify whether leadership has an effective role in narrowing the gap between vulnerable children and young people and other children.

Findings:
- The literature provides little evidence of the impacts of leadership whether at an operational, strategic or political level, on outcomes for children and young people. It is particularly limited in terms of evidencing the contribution of leadership to narrowing the gap.
- In contrast, interviewees in the case-study phase of the research identified where particular gaps in outcomes had been narrowed and determined a link with effective leadership, albeit often indirect and mediated through other factors.
- The impact of leadership on narrowing the gap was most often evidenced in relation to educational achievement and to improving outcomes for looked after children (LAC).

- The contribution of leadership to narrowing the gap was also identified in terms of health-related outcomes, post-16 education, employment and training outcomes (EET), and the participation and voice of vulnerable groups.
- Effective leadership for narrowing the gap is not fundamentally different from effective leadership generally. However, the gap appears to be narrowed through leadership which emphasises:
  - Prioritising the most vulnerable and developing a local vision
  - Championing the voice of vulnerable groups and encouraging their participation
  - Using good quality data to identify needs and provide services for vulnerable groups
  - Fostering partnership working around vulnerable groups
  - Developing and motivating the workforce to improve outcomes for vulnerable groups
  - Having an unrelenting drive and passion to improve outcomes for vulnerable groups

### Narrowing the Gap in Outcomes: Parental engagement

Reference: Grayson, H. (2013). *Rapid Review of Parental Engagement and Narrowing the Gap in Attainment for Disadvantaged Children* (forthcoming)

This NFER/OUP rapid review explored parental engagement in education and its links to closing the attainment gap, with a particular focus on studies involving disadvantaged children and families. It looked at research published in the two years subsequent to a Department for Education review on the same topic (Goodall *et al.,* 2011)[1]. Many of the strategies reviewed were reported to be successful for families from all backgrounds, including for disadvantaged families.

Key findings:
- A number of parenting characteristics are statistically associated with children's levels of achievement, including parental promotion of reading and learning, parents' relationships and interactions with the child, and disciplinary practices. This is the case across all levels of family resources, suggesting that positive parenting benefits children regardless of their socioeconomic circumstance.
- Reported outcomes of increased parental engagement include improved academic performance; improved relationships between parents, teachers and schools; and increased parental involvement in schools.
- Interventions focusing on both academic outcomes and parenting skills are more effective than interventions addressing either aspect in isolation.

---

[1] Goodall, J. and Vorhaus, J., with Carpentieri, J., Brooks, G., Akerman, A. and Harris, A. (2011). *Review of Best Practice in Parental Engagement* (Research Report DFE-RR156). London: DfE [online]. Available: https://www.education.gov.uk/publications/RSG/publicationDetail/Page1/DFE-RR156 [26 March, 2013].

- Support and training for parents can achieve greater parental confidence in managing children's behaviour and supporting children's learning.
- Parental engagement can improve the home learning environment, leading to increased parental confidence in supporting children's literacy at home and a major impact on achievement.
- There is robust evidence of the impact of family learning, literacy and numeracy (FLLN) programmes for disadvantaged families.
- There is a large volume of evidence on the impact of parental engagement programmes on children's literacy, but much less for other curriculum areas.

**Narrowing the Gap in Outcomes for Vulnerable Groups: Overview and Analysis of Available Datasets on Vulnerable Groups and the Five Every Child Matters Outcomes**
Reference: Morris, M., Rutt, S., Kendall, L. and Mehta, P. (2008). *Overview and Analysis of Available Datasets on Vulnerable Groups and the Five ECM Outcomes (*Narrowing the Gap in Outcomes for Vulnerable Groups)*. Slough: NFER [online]. *Available:* http://www.nfer.ac.uk/publications/LND01/

This comprehensive data mapping and analysis study carried out in September and October 2007 sought to scope, map and assess national and other large datasets relating to the outcomes for vulnerable groups across the five Every Child Matters areas. It aimed to identify what useful and comparable data was and was not readily available and to provide information on the nature, size and extent of any gaps. The data mapping found that:

- Where data was collected at individual child level, it was possible to identify significant gaps in a number of ECM outcomes for children and young people from lower socio-economic groups, for looked after children, for children with special educational needs, for children with poor attendance, for those who had been excluded from school and for children and young people from some minority ethnic groups.
- More generally, even the best datasets were not comprehensive and there was a lack of consistency in defining or identifying vulnerable groups between datasets.
- The overall quality and nature of data on many of the outcomes was insufficiently detailed to allow the extent of any gap to be identified for some of the groups.
- Data was not collected in a way that facilitated accurate comparisons over time and was insufficiently robust to enable judgements to be made as to whether gaps were widening or narrowing.

**Key messages from NFER research on the Pupil Premium**

Reference: Cunningham, R. and Lewis, K. (2012). *NFER Teacher Voice Omnibus 2012 Survey: the Use of the Pupil Premium*. Slough: NFER [online]. Available: http://www.nfer.ac.uk/nfer/publications/91062/91062_home.cfm?publicationID=718&title =NFER%20Teacher%20Voice%20Omnibus%202012%20Survey:%20The%20use%20of%20the %20Pupil%20Premium

The Sutton Trust submitted 13 questions in the NFER's Teacher Voice omnibus survey in February 2012. This report forms part of the output from the omnibus survey, concerning specifically the questions over the use of the Pupil Premium in schools. A sample of over 1600 teachers completed the survey. The questions asked teachers (both primary and secondary) about the Pupil Premium and the top three priorities for extra spending at their school. Teachers were given a list of options to choose from. The survey found that:

- Early intervention schemes, reducing class sizes, more one-to-one tuition and additional teaching assistants in the school were the most frequently cited priorities for the Pupil Premium.
- 28 per cent of the teachers in the survey did not know what the top priority for the Pupil Premium spending was in their school.
- More than half (52%) of the teachers surveyed said that their school uses past experience of what works to decide which approaches and programmes to adopt to improve pupils' learning. Just over a third (36%) said their school looks at research evidence on the impact of different approaches and programmes.
- Large proportions of teachers indicated that their school uses informal methods of evaluating approaches and programmes. These include trial-and-error approaches and learning from the experiences of other schools. While a large proportion of teachers believed that decisions in their school are based on research evidence, it is unclear what evidence they are using.

Reference: Ager, R. and Pyle, K. (2013). *NFER Teacher Voice Omnibus 2013 Survey: Spending Priorities for the Pupil Premium*. Slough: NFER [online]. Available: http://www.nfer.ac.uk/nfer/publications/99929/99929_home.cfm?publicationID=930&title =NFER%20Teacher%20Voice%20Omnibus%20March%202013%20Survey:%20Spending%20P riorities%20for%20the%20Pupil%20Premium

In March 2013 the Sutton Trust repeated two of the questions from the February 2012 survey. 1587 primary and secondary teachers took part in the March 2013 Teacher Voice survey. The findings were similar across both surveys:

- Early intervention schemes, more one-to-one tuition, and additional teaching assistants remained the most frequently cited priorities for Pupil Premium spending in 2013. However, reducing class sizes fell from being the second most selected top priority in 2012 to the fifth most common option in 2013.
- Responses about how schools make decisions about which approaches to use to improve pupil learning were also largely unchanged. Again, informal methods of

evaluating approaches and programmes dominated, with the most common response being the use of past experience of what works (selected by 55 per cent of teachers).

- However, the proportion of teachers who said that their school looks at research evidence on the impact of different approaches and programmes rose from 36 per cent in 2012 to 42 per cent in 2013; while the proportion reporting they read the Pupil Premium toolkit increased from five to 14 per cent.

Reference: Durbin, B. (2010). *School Funding and the Pupil Premium: What Changes Will the New System Bring?* Slough: NFER [online]. Available: http://www.nfer.ac.uk/publications/99909

This NFER research undertaken in advance of the introduction of the Pupil Premium identified that, in the absence of specific restrictions on spending, additional funding for pupils on free school meals (FSM) in schools, was spent on a wide range of areas, not all of which were likely to directly or preferentially benefit disadvantaged pupils. Of the additional funds available for FSM pupils, 39 per cent went on classroom staff, 15 per cent on external costs, 15 per cent on support staff costs and 12 per cent on learning resources (including ICT). Whilst it was not possible to determine the detail of this spending on a case by case basis, it would appear that schools were using the additional FSM funding to top-up their budgets across the board, including areas not likely to directly benefit FSM pupils such as non-classroom support staff. Nevertheless, the emphasis remained on classroom staff and on other areas which could potentially target those pupils on free school meals. This includes additional learning resources and external costs including agency supply staff – one use for which could be providing cover whilst permanent staff undergo additional specialist training.

**Key messages from NFER research on local authority child poverty strategies**

**Local Authority Progress in Tackling Child Poverty**
Reference:  Nelson, J., O'Donnell, L. and Filmer-Sankey, C. (2011). *Local Authority Progress in Tackling Child Poverty (LGA Research Report).* Slough: NFER [online]. Available:
http://www.nfer.ac.uk/nfer/publications/LGCP01/LGCP01.pdf

This assessment of local authorities' progress in meeting the duties placed on them by the 2010 Child Poverty Act, specifically the requirement to complete a local needs assessment and a joint local child poverty strategy, involved in-depth telephone interviews with 43 child poverty partnership members across nine case study areas.  It found that:

- Eradication of child poverty is a high priority across the case study areas, but there are concerns about the lack of statutory and prescriptive guidance from government and about the effects of public-sector budget reductions.
- Child poverty partnerships would appreciate greater direction and support from government and some form of statutory guidance for LAs on tackling child poverty.
- Most child poverty partnerships are well developed and interviewees consider them to have the key ingredients for successful collaboration - a clear understanding of roles and responsibilities; a shared commitment to a common goal; a focus on outcomes for children and families; good leadership; and the right mix of people in the partnership.
- Partnerships have clear views on the guidance and support they need to drive their work forward which include ongoing help from external advisors, guidance on pooling budgets, evidence of business cases and of value for money, and support to keep child poverty high on the agenda as LA services are reconfigured.
- Child poverty partners are concerned about how they will turn their strategic planning into effective action, and whether their strategies will have a positive impact on families and children.  Their concerns relate to budget reductions and service cut-backs, rising poverty rates due to the increasing cost of living and the enormity of the task of overcoming structural and culturally ingrained poverty.  Many believe that partnerships can make a difference if they focus on direct intervention with families rather than macro-economic issues.
- Most partnerships are planning to tackle poverty, initially, in small and manageable ways by focusing on specific localities, families and groups and by using a range of pre-existing interventions based on four objectives: reducing unemployment, improving financial literacy, improving health, and giving children the best start in life.

**Tackling Child Poverty Through Whole-Area Strategies**

Reference: Nelson, J., Wilson, R. and Bielby, G. (2010). *Tackling Child Poverty through Whole-Area Strategies (C4EO Child Poverty Knowledge Review)*. London: Centre for Excellence and Outcomes in Children and Young People's Services [online]. Available: http://www.c4eo.org.uk/themes/poverty/childpovertystrategies/files/child_poverty_full_knowledge_review.pdf

The key messages from this review of literature and of local practice examples on the elements of an effective whole-area child poverty strategy were that:

- The requirements of the Child Poverty Act will only be met if service providers successfully draw on all experience, resource and expertise across a whole area. Engaging in a collective process of vision building and action planning, backed by strong leadership, and having partners with decision-making autonomy, are key.
- Long-term and suitably high levels of funding are crucial. There must also be sufficient capacity for the development and implementation phases of a strategy and multi-agency resource pooling.
- Key stakeholders, children, young people, families and communities need to actively and meaningfully participate in the development of a vision and strategy and understand this vision.
- A mixed economy of provision is required that can help the workless into work, help those in work to progress and financially support those unable to work. There also needs to be a non-judgemental official and public response to those living in poverty.
- There needs to be a focus on narrowing outcome gaps for children and young people living in poverty. Education and health inequalities can be reduced by developing parenting skills early; targeting funding at schools in deprived areas; developing a collaborative or multi-agency approach to meet assessed need; and taking services (especially health services) to the community bases frequented by poor families.
- The approach to child poverty strategies needs to be differentiated. Sometimes a 'people-focused' approach may be more beneficial than a 'place-based' focus. Where the focus is place-based, strategies needs to bear in mind that poverty can be rural as well as urban. Certain 'groups' may also require specific attention - young parents, young people leaving care, and households with a disabled member, for example.

**Evaluation of SHINE on Saturdays**

Reference: Chamberlain, T., Aston, H., George, N., Sharp, C. and Sanders, D. (2011)
*Evaluation of SHINE on Saturdays.* Slough: NFER [online]. Available:
http://www.nfer.ac.uk/publications/ESOS01

NFER was also commissioned by the SHINE Trust in 2010 to evaluate the impact of its SHINE on Saturdays programme. This involves the Trust funding schools or other educational organisations to provide a SHINE on Saturday school aimed at underachieving children from disadvantaged backgrounds. The SHINE on Saturday model emphasises the creative curriculum and is based on alternative and accelerated learning concepts.

NFER's evaluation found that the programme is helping students to develop a positive attitude towards learning, which was reported to have had a knock-on effect on widening participation in post-compulsory education and training, as students' aspirations for the future also improved.

**Key findings**
- The programme is having a positive impact on the lives of students in terms of learning, social and emotional outcomes and there were clear examples of the programme providing additional learning and enrichment opportunities for students.
- Students are positive about the programme's impact on their learning and attainment data indicates that their progress is on a par with expected progress for children at Key Stage 2.
- The programme is also having a positive impact on teaching staff and schools. Teaching at SHINE on Saturday can renew staff enthusiasm for teaching, and curriculum and pedagogical innovation has transferred from SHINE on Saturday into Monday to Friday school in some instances.
- The programme is reported to have had a positive impact on encouraging closer links within communities and parental engagement